



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/737,409	12/16/2003	Brad Joseph	FMC 1529 PUS / 201-1421	7622
28395	7590	02/27/2008		
BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C./FGTL 1000 TOWN CENTER 22ND FLOOR SOUTHFIELD, MI 48075-1238			EXAMINER RAPILLO, KRISTINE K	
			ART UNIT 3626	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/27/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/737,409	<b>Applicant(s)</b> JOSEPH ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> KRISTINE K. RAPILLO	<b>Art Unit</b> 3626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 41 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 December 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/16/2003; 3/11/2004</u> .                                   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1 – 41 are pending.

#### ***Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: Figure 1 – 202, 204; Figure 3 – 8, 32; and, Figure 8 – 50. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 68 (Figure 11).

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character “74” (Figure 11) has been used to designate both Case Detail Report (drawing) and Database Data Exports (Specification, page 64, line 1).

***Claim Objections***

4. Claim 41 is objected to because of the following informalities: Improper punctuation used - the MPEP states periods should only be used at the end of a claim, not in the body of the claim unless it is an abbreviation (see MPEP 608.01 (m)[R-3]). Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1 – 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CompWatch® (www.bsiweb.com, Benefit Software, 2002) in view of Jensen (U.S. Patent No. 6,065,000).

In regard to claim 1, CompWatch® teaches a system for automated health and safety information management, the system comprising one or more computers operably programmed and configured to: receive a plurality of data concerning patient medical visits resulting from occupational health or safety incidents (paragraph 93) and process the data to automatically identify one or more patient medical visits that are OSHA-recordable (Figure 3 and paragraphs 2, 100). As per the specification, OSHA recordable visits are any type of medical visit included in an official OSHA log.

CompWatch® fails to teach a system configured to output a report including a summary of the data characterizing one or more patient medical visits that are OSHA-recordable.

Jensen teaches a system configured to output a report including a summary of the data characterizing one or more patient medical visits that are OSHA-recordable (Figure 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a system configured to output a report including a summary of the data characterizing one or more patient medical visits that are OSHA-recordable as taught by Jensen, into the system of CompWatch®, with the

motivation of automating the process of documenting OSHA-recordable health and safety information (Figure 2).

In regard to claim 2, CompWatch® teaches the system of claim 1 wherein the data is processed based on pre-defined OSHA logic (paragraphs 24 – 26).

In regard to claim 3, CompWatch® teaches the system of claim 1 wherein the plurality of data characterizing the patient medical visit includes data representing the date of the incident, whether the patient died or lost consciousness, diagnosis, treatment, medications, test orders, referrals, medical leaves, medical restrictions, or an indication as to whether the patient is fit for work (Figures 3 and 4, and paragraphs 102 -103).

In regard to claim 4, CompWatch® teaches the system of claim 1 wherein the one or more computers are additionally programmed and configured to automatically display an indication as to whether enough data characterizing the patient medical visits has been provided to determine whether the visit is OSHA- recordable (Figure 3, and paragraph 100).

In regard to claim 5, CompWatch® teaches the system of claim 1 wherein the data processed includes data characterizing one or more prior medical visits for a particular patient (Figure 5 and paragraph 101).

In regard to claim 6, CompWatch® teaches the system of claim 1 wherein the occupational health or safety incidents include injuries (Figure 2).

CompWatch® fails to teach a system where the occupational health or safety incidents include illnesses.

Jensen teaches a system where the occupational health or safety incidents include illnesses (Figure 38).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a system where the occupational health or safety incidents include illnesses as taught by Jensen, into the system of CompWatch®, with the motivation of providing a means for automating the tracking and historical data of a company's OSHA-recordable incidents (column 1, lines 19 - 30).

In regard to claim 7, CompWatch® teaches the system of claim 1 wherein the one or more computers are additionally programmed and configured to query the plurality of data concerning patient medical visits according to a plurality of user-defined criteria (Figure 8 and paragraphs 106 – 107).

In regard to claim 8, CompWatch® teaches a system for automated health and safety information management as per claim 1.

CompWatch® fails to teach a system wherein the one or more computers are additionally programmed and configured to generate a report summarizing the occupational health or safety incidents for a particular organizational location or patient.

Jensen teaches a system wherein the one or more computers are additionally programmed and configured to generate a report summarizing the occupational health or safety incidents for a particular organizational location or patient (column 13, line 62 through column 14, line 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a system wherein the one or more computers are additionally programmed and configured to generate a report summarizing the occupational health or safety incidents for a particular organizational location or patient as taught by Jensen with the motivation of providing a summary of all captured data for the purpose of tracking and presenting the data for OSHA-recordable events in an OSHA approved format (column 1, lines 19 - 30).

In regard to claim 9, CompWatch® teaches a system for automated health and safety information management as per claim 1.

CompWatch® fails to teach a system wherein the one or more computers are additionally programmed and configured to generate a report summarizing patient medical leaves of absence for a particular organizational location or patient.

Jensen teaches a system wherein the one or more computers are additionally programmed and configured to generate a report summarizing patient medical leaves of



absence for a particular organizational location or patient (Tables 4 - 5 and column 5, lines 29 - 44).

The motivation to combine the teachings of CompWatch® and Jensen is discussed in the rejection of claim 8, and incorporated herein.

In regard to claim 10, CompWatch® teaches the system of claim 1 wherein the one or more computers are additionally programmed and configured to generate a report summarizing patient medical restrictions for a particular organizational location or patient (paragraphs 31 and 32).

In regard to claim 11, CompWatch® teaches a system for automated health and safety information management as per claim 1.

CompWatch® fails to teach a system wherein the one or more computers are additionally programmed and configured to generate a report summarizing patient medical visits for a particular organizational location or patient.

Jensen teaches a system wherein the one or more computers are additionally programmed and configured to generate a report summarizing patient medical visits for a particular organizational location or patient (Table 4). Table 4 lists the fields available for import and export of data for the accident form (Figure 30), including hospitalization, physician, and injuries.

The motivation to combine the teachings of CompWatch® and Jensen is discussed in the rejection of claim 8, and incorporated herein.

In regard to claim 12, CompWatch® teaches a system for automated health and safety information management as per claim 1.

CompWatch® fails to teach a system wherein the one or more computers are additionally programmed and configured to electronically dispatch an investigator to investigate one or more of the occupational health or safety incidents.

Jensen teaches a system wherein the one or more computers are additionally programmed and configured to electronically dispatch an investigator to investigate one or more of the occupational health or safety incidents (Figure 8 and Table 6). Table 6 lists the fields available for import/export purposes to the SOS form (Figure 8). The Examiner has interpreted “electronically dispatch” as an investigator is electronically notified of a pending investigation.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a system wherein the one or more computers are additionally programmed and configured to electronically dispatch an investigator to investigate one or more of the occupational health or safety incidents as taught by Jensen with the motivation of providing a tool to alert investigators of any occupational health and safety incidents in a timely manner (column 5, lines 13 -16).

In regard to claim 13, CompWatch® teaches a system for automated health and safety information management as per claim 1.

CompWatch® fails to teach a system wherein the one or more computers are additionally programmed and configured to receive a plurality of data concerning an investigation of one or more of the occupational health or safety incidents.

Jensen teaches a system wherein the one or more computers are additionally programmed and configured to receive a plurality of data concerning an investigation of one or more of the occupational health or safety incidents (Table 6 and Figure 8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a system wherein the one or more computers are additionally programmed and configured to receive a plurality of data concerning an investigation of one or more of the occupational health or safety incidents as taught by Jensen with the motivation of providing an investigator with a tool to collect OSHA recordable data from a variety of databases (Figure 2).

In regard to claim 14, CompWatch® teaches the system of claim 13.

CompWatch® fails to teach a system wherein the one or more computers are additionally programmed and configured to query the plurality of data concerning an investigation of one or more of the occupational health or safety incidents.

Jensen teaches a system wherein the one or more computers are additionally programmed and configured to query the plurality of data concerning an investigation of one or more of the occupational health or safety incidents (Table 6 and Figure 8).

The motivation to combine the teachings of CompWatch® and Jensen is discussed in the rejection of claim 13, and incorporated herein.

In regard to claim 15, CompWatch® teaches the system of claim 13.

CompWatch® fails to teach a system wherein the one or more computers are additionally programmed and configured to generate a report summarizing one or more incident investigations.

Jensen teaches a system wherein the one or more computers are additionally programmed and configured to generate a report summarizing one or more incident investigations (Table 6 and Figure 69). Figure 69 illustrates a date range and specific criteria selection to generate a graphical report to summarize the data selected.

The motivation to combine the teachings of CompWatch® and Jensen is discussed in the rejection of claim 8, and incorporated herein.

In regard to claim 16, CompWatch® teaches the system of claim 13.

CompWatch® fails to teach a system wherein the plurality of data concerning the investigation includes one or more corrective actions to avoid reoccurrence of the one or more of occupational health or safety incidents.

Jensen teaches a system wherein the plurality of data concerning the investigation includes one or more corrective actions to avoid reoccurrence of the one or more of occupational health or safety incidents (Figure 44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a system wherein the plurality of data concerning the investigation includes one or more corrective actions to avoid

Art Unit: 3626

reoccurrence of the one or more of occupational health or safety incidents as taught by Jensen with the motivation of providing a tool to track OSHA recordable incidents and their respective corrective actions; this enables the generation of combined data to be used a training tool for employees to ensure the incident(s) are not repeated (column 5, lines 10 – 13).

In regard to claim 17, CompWatch® teaches the system of claim 16 wherein the one or more computers are additionally programmed and configured to generate a report summarizing corrective actions (paragraph 49 and Figure 44).

In regard to claim 18, CompWatch® teaches the system of claim 1 wherein the one or more computers are additionally programmed and configured to: filter received data at one or more filter levels based on one or more user-defined criteria (paragraph 40); and generate a report based on the filtered data (paragraphs 44 – 45).

In regard to claim 19, CompWatch® teaches the system of claim 18 wherein the filter levels include worker characteristics, injury/illness codes, work assignment or time period (paragraph 40).

In regard to claim 20, CompWatch® teaches the system of claim 18 wherein the report includes a bar chart or a time trend (paragraphs 44 - 46).

Method claims 21 – 40 repeat the subject matter of system claims 1 – 20 as a series of steps rather than a set of apparatus elements. As the underlying elements of claims 1 – 20 have been shown to be fully disclosed by the teachings of CompWatch® and Jensen in the above rejection of claims 1 – 20, it is readily apparent that the system disclosed by CompWatch® and Jensen performs these steps. As such, these limitations (claims 21 – 40) are rejected for the same reasons given above for system claims 1 – 20 and incorporated herein.

In regard to claim 41, CompWatch® teaches computer software embodied in a computer-readable medium for automated health and safety information management, the computer software comprising:

an electronic medical record module configured to:

(i) receive a plurality of data concerning patient medical visits resulting from occupational health or safety incidents (paragraph 93);

(ii) process the data based on pre-defined OSHA logic to automatically identify one or more patient medical visits that are OSHA-recordable (Figure 3 and paragraphs 2, 100); and

a data analysis module configured to:

(i) filter received data at one or more filter levels based on one or more user-defined criteria (paragraph 40); and

(ii) generate a plurality of reports based on the filtered data (paragraphs 44 – 45).

CompWatch® fails to teach an electronic medical record module configured to output a report including a summary or the data characterizing one or more patient medical visits that are OSHA-recordable; an incident investigation module configured to electronically dispatch an investigator to investigate one or more of the occupational health or safety incidents; and receive a plurality of data concerning an investigation of one or more of the occupational health or safety incidents including one or more corrective actions to avoid reoccurrence of the one or more of occupational health or safety incidents.

Jensen teaches an electronic medical record module configured to output a report including a summary or the data characterizing one or more patient medical visits that are OSHA-recordable (Figure 10); an incident investigation module configured to electronically dispatch an investigator to investigate one or more of the occupational health or safety incidents (Table 6 and Figure 8); and receive a plurality of data concerning an investigation of one or more of the occupational health or safety incidents including one or more corrective actions to avoid reoccurrence of the one or more of occupational health or safety incidents (Figure 44).

The motivation to combine the teachings of CompWatch® and Jensen is discussed in the rejection of Claim 1, and incorporated herein.

### ***Conclusion***

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Larkin et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0069089 A1) teaches a

Art Unit: 3626

workplace related injury management system which entails various databases (injury, treatment, and diagnosis).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KRISTINE K. RAPILLO whose telephone number is (571)270-3325. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday 6:30 am to 4 pm Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on 571-272-3776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KKR

/Joseph Thomas/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3626